



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

a very corrupt court. She was a Jacobite, and after 1688 retired to a country residence at Eastwell, with her husband, a nobleman devoted to 'Antiquities' and other mild virtuositities, who figures in her poetry as Dafnis, Flavio, and by other pastoral names. She was the object of half-ironical compliments from Pope and Swift.

Miss Reynolds has done her editorial work with commendable thoroughness; though the elaborate analyses, in her introduction, of Lady Winchilsea's literary qualities and attitudes, are out of proportion to the importance of the subject.

HENRY A. BEERS.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

---

*Essays on the Study and Use of Poetry, by Plutarch and Basil the Great.* Translated from the Greek, with an Introduction, by Frederic Morgan Padelford, Ph. D., Professor of the English Language and Literature in the University of Washington. (*Yale Studies in English* XV. Albert S. Cook, Editor.) New York : Henry Holt & Co., 1902. Pp. 136.

This is a useful and timely addition to existing apparatus for the study of literary criticism and poetics, more especially for the study of these subjects from the evolutionary point of view. It should be followed by other translations, until the whole body of ancient critical literature becomes available for those who have not the time or the preparation for reading the originals. One particularly feels the need of such a series in reading Saintsbury's *History of Criticism*. Few students have the courage, or the wind, to follow this omnilegent author in his headlong career through the classical remains—

Tramp! tramp! along the land . . .  
 Splash! splash! along the sea.

But with the aid of a critical prose anthology, in translation, one might hope at least to cling panting to his skirts.

Professor Padelford's translation appears upon scrutiny to be worthy of inclusion in such a critical anthology. I will not pretend that I have compared it sentence for sentence with the original throughout, but wherever I have made comparison I have generally found the English a fairly close and critical rendering of the Greek. Nor is it a labored rendering; it reflects, as the translator in his pre-

face modestly hopes it may, the style and spirit of the original. Two departures from the original may however be noted at this point. Referring to page 53, line 3, where the text reads, 'A probable fiction is more impressive and acceptable than a fixed truth, which is without plot, and simple in metre and diction,' I venture to doubt whether 'fixed truth' is the most plausible rendering of *κατασκευῆς*. The sense of the passage seems rather to be, 'A probable falsehood is more impressive and acceptable than a bit of discourse which is without plot,' etc. Notice also that by inserting the comma before the relative pronoun the translator seems to make Plutarch say that all fixed truths are without plot and simple in metre and diction, whereas the force of the relative clause is obviously restrictive. Is the punctuation a survival from one of the older translations?

In the same paragraph occurs the following sentence: 'For neither metre, nor tropes, nor harmony of construction, is so winsome and engaging as a well-woven fabric of fiction.' As a free translation of *Οὔτε γὰρ μέτρον, οὔτε τρόπος, οὔτε λέξεως ὄγκος, οὔτ' εὐκαιρία μεταφορᾶς, οὔτε ἁρμονία καὶ σύνθεσις ἔχει τοσούτον αἰμυλίας καὶ χάριτος, ὅσον εἰ πεποιμένη διάθεσις μυθολογίας*, this may pass muster for the general reader; but as a critical translation for the student of poetics it is hardly satisfactory. It is at any rate open to the charge that it fails to suggest in any way the presence of the technical term *ὄγκος*, which has played a rather important part in the history of criticism.

The introductions impress me as less valuable than the translations. Like the translations, they are faithful and scholarly, and show an intimate acquaintance with the literature of the subject, but they exhibit less insight in their special field. That field, I take it, is the history of poetics. What does the student of poetics expect to learn about Plutarch and Basil from such a commentary as this? Not merely what they said—that he can discover for himself in their essays; nor when they lived and what their characters were—these things are in every encyclopædia. What he has a right to expect is something quite different: it is a definite placing of each author in the development of ancient literary theory. Aristotle made some advance upon Plato, Longinus on Aristotle, Plutarch on Longinus, and so on down the ages. That is the assumption, surely, which underlies all modern study of the subject. Now what place does Plutarch hold in this chain of theorizings? What painful inch has he gained? What do we know about poetics now which we should never have known (in all probability) if Plutarch had not revealed it to us? These are the questions that interest me as a student of the

history of poetics. In this field they seem to me by far the most important questions that can be asked. More than that, the answers to other important questions depend upon them. But they seem not to have interested Professor Padelford very much. He does indeed compare the ideas of Plutarch with those of Aristotle and of Plato, but he sets them side by side as a man might compare the plans of three houses: this house has five closets, that has ten; the second house has the dining-room where the third has the study; and so on. This sort of thing, however useful it may be to the person who does it, is after all of very little value to others. It is too much like bookkeeping. It lacks the germinating idea, the causal nexus, the sense of onward movement, which alone can give life and value to such studies.

I have spoken of Professor's Saintsbury's work. The great defect of his big book, in my estimation, is just this, that it gets nowhere. We are for ever climbing up the climbing wave and coming down again into the hollow, without catching a glimpse, or at any rate more than a glimpse, of the Happy Isles. Not for this was the science of literary criticism brought into being.

I regret that I cannot supply what seems to me to be lacking in Professor Padelford's otherwise excellent expositions. I regret this particularly in the case of Plutarch, for the real nature of Plutarch's contribution to literary criticism has always been a puzzle to me. His attitude toward poetry seems at first view to be simply stupid and perverse and pigheaded. He sees in poetry only a trick of certain men, avid of applause, for drawing attention to themselves. Mr. Bosanquet (*History of Æsthetic*, page 106) and Eduard Müller (*Geschichte der Theorie der Kunst bei den Alten* 2. 208) agree that Plutarch's one advance upon Aristotle is his somewhat plainer statement of the question, Can what is really ugly become beautiful in art? This may be true, and yet I seem to see in the essay before me the germ of another idea, unperceived by Aristotle, and it may be not yet fully appreciated. It occurs in what appears at first contact to be the most barren and fatuous part of the essay (Section IV). Plutarch is showing how the immoral and disgusting passages in any author's poetry may be rendered innocuous by setting over against them contradictory passages. 'But,' he goes on, 'if any of the poets do not themselves offer an escape from these things which they have said amiss, it is well to employ the contrary sentiments of other famous men so that the better may outbalance the worse.' Is it to reason too curiously to see in this advice a conception of the

organic character, the solidarity, of literature? Crude, negative, and perverse as the idea is in the form in which Plutarch presents it, still it anticipates in a way the modern notion that each element and type of the whole body of literature has its peculiar part to play in fashioning the soul of man. I do not know of any preceding statement of this thought. Plato comes very near to saying it in the *Gorgias*, and clearly recognizes the principle in his treatment of music in the *Republic* (3. 399), but he does not apply the thought to literature, so far as I recall. Perhaps some reader of this journal may be able to set me right in this matter.

Of minor errors the list is brief. (1) On p. 39 the date of Basil's death should be 379 instead of 279. (2) Several of the references to Aristotle's *Poetics* on pp. 52 and 53 are incorrect. (3) The practice of quoting, in the foot-notes, as on pp. 76 and 94, from dictionaries and encyclopædias, without giving the authorities for the quotations, is an editorial vice in which no scholar can safely indulge. (4) Now and then the foot-notes are inapt. Thus to illustrate Plutarch's observation (p. 53) that 'color in painting is more effective than line because more lifelike and illusive,' the editor quotes without comment the sentence from Aristotle's *Poetics*: 'The most beautiful colors, laid on confusedly, will not give as much pleasure as the chalk outline of a portrait.' The implication is that the thoughts of the two writers here run parallel, whereas in point of fact the two passages present a curious and complicated antithesis, the exposition of which would require an extended commentary.

FRED NEWTON SCOTT.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

---

*Shakspeare and his Forerunners: Studies in Elizabethan Poetry and its Development from Early English.* By Sidney Lanier. Illustrated. Two Volumes. New York: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1902. Pp. xxiv, 324, and xix, 329.

The purpose of the following notice is to call attention to the value of this work for the literary study of Old English. The chapters which have to do with our earliest literature are these: II. The Supernatural in Early English and in Shakspeare. *Address of the Soul to the Dead Body* Compared with *Hamlet*. III. Nature in